

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: HSIAO, Cheng-Fang

SERIAL NO.: 10/688,185

ART UNIT: 2834

FILED: October 20, 2003

EXAMINER: Comas, Y.

TITLE: DIRECT CURRENT BRUSHLESS VIBRATION MOTOR

Amendment B: REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, previous Claims 1 - 2 have been canceled and new Claim 3 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of distinguishing the present invention from the prior art.

In the Office Action, it was indicated that Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over the Hong publication in view of the Inariba patent. Claim 2 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The drawings were objected to for failing to show all features of the claims. The specification was objected to for introducing new matter.

As an overview to the present reply, Applicant has amended the drawings and specification to properly recite the features of the claim language, including the cancellation of new matter and proper recitation of the elements actually disclosed in the original specification. New independent Claim 3 expresses the proper limitations in a more proper U.S. format, so as to distinguish the present invention from the prior art combination.

In particular, new independent Claim 3 replaces "annular slot" with "rotor mounting slot". The original Figure 1 disclosed the rotor mounting slot as reference numeral 201. The original

Paragraph [0012] of the specification also recited this element of the claim. The corresponding proper structural interrelationships throughout Claim 3 have been corrected. Applicant respectfully contends that the proper naming of the "rotor mounting slot" traverses the objections to the drawings and specification with regard to new matter. The "annular slot" term was not proper in light of the already named "rotor mounting slot" with reference numeral "201". This "rotor mounting slot" was also included in the original Claim 1.

In order to distinguish the present invention from the prior art combination, Applicant has proceeded to further describe the features of the rotor mounting slot 201. Applicant has included the structures and relationships of the plurality of coil plates 204 forming annular slots 205 and a coil contact 206 extending outwardly of the annular slots 205. These elements of the stator 2 are clearly disclosed in the original Figure 1 throughout all of the amendments. The relationships described are also apparent from the drawings. The specification has been amended to include a written description of these structural relationships between elements. Furthermore, the pole teeth are described as being in electromagnetic contact with the coil contact 206, which follows from the description of the magnetic effect on the vibration of the motor.

With specific regard to the prior art combination, Applicant respectfully contends that the present invention of Claim 3 is not made obvious. As previously presented and acknowledged by the Examiner, the Hong publication discloses a vibration motor that is quite different from the present invention. Importantly, the Hong publication lacks the series of pole teeth formed on the inner wall surrounding the rotor mounting slot of the stator. In combination with the Inariba patent, the inner wall with pole teeth element is disclosed. However, the combination still fails to disclose the stator element as originally shown in the figures and as now claimed in new Claim 3. The

combination does not include an inner wall having a plurality of coil plates forming annular slots with a coil contact extending outwardly of the annular slots. The inner wall of the prior art combination lacks these structures. None of the disclosures teach the coil plates on the stator element. Furthermore, the obvious coil contacts (206) of the original figure have a particular relation to the plurality of teeth and do not appear anywhere in the prior art combination. As such, the properly claims subject matter of the invention is not made obvious by the prior art combination cited in the Final Action of January 25, 2006.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, Applicant contends that independent Claim 3 is now in a proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims at an early date is earnestly solicited. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

<u>December 5, 2006</u>	<u>/Andrew W. Chu/</u>
Date	John S. Egbert; Reg. No. 30,627
	Andrew W. Chu; Reg. No. 46,625
Customer No. 24106	Egbert Law Offices
	412 Main Street, 7th Floor
	Houston, Texas 77002
	(713)224-8080
	(713)223-4873 fax

\*Marked Up Copy\*

On page 3, revise paragraph [0012] as follows:

[0012] The stator 2 is mounted in the lower housing 1 and is provided in the center with a rotor mounting slot 201 which is provided with an inner wall with a series of pole teeth 202. The inner wall 203 having a plurality of coil plates 204 forming annular slots 205 and a coil contact 206 extending outwardly of the annular slots 205. The pole teeth are in electromagnetic contact with the coil contact 206.